mine molecular sequence data for *Pholidornis* and other Old World songbirds. The National Science Foundation (NSF), Boston University and the University of Michigan provided financial support.

LITERATURE

ARCTANDER, P. & FJELDSÅ, J. (1994): Avian tissue collections for DNA analysis. Ibis **136**: 359-360.

ARCTANDER, P. (1995): Comparison of a mitochondrial gene and a corresponding nuclear pseudogene. Proc. Roy. Soc. London, series B Biol. Sci. **262**: 13-19.

BAPTISTA, L. F., LAWSON, R., VISSER, E. & BELL, D. A. (1999): Relationships of some mannikins and waxbills in the Estrildidae. J. Ornithol. **140**: 179-192.

BENSASSON, D., ZHANG, D.-X., HARTL, D. L. & HEWITT, G. M. (2001): Mitochondrial pseudogenes: evolution's misplaced witnesses. Trends Ecol. Evol. **16**: 314-321.

CHAPIN, J. P. (1954): The birds of the Belgian Congo, part 4. Bull. Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist. **75B**.

CLARK, G. A. (1973): Notched toe pads in climbing oscines. Condor **75**: 119-120.

CLAYTON, N. S. (1989): The effects of cross-fostering on selective song learning in estrildid finches. Behaviour **109**: 163-175.

COOPER, A. (1994): DNA from museum specimens. In: Ancient DNA (ed. B. Herrmann & S. Herrmann), pp. 149-165. New York: Springer.

COOPER, A., RHYMER, J. M., JAMES, H. F., OLSON, S. L., MCINTOSH, C. E., SORENSON, M. D. & FLEISCHER, R. C. (1996): Conservation management of island endemics using ancient DNA. Nature **381**: 484.

COOPER, A., LAZUELA-FOX, C., ANDERSON, S., RAMBAUT, A., AUTIN, J. & WARD, R. (2001): Complete mitochondrial genome sequences of two extinct moas clarify ratite evolution. Nature **409**: 704-707.

CRACRAFT, J. & FEINSTEIN, J. (2000): What is not a bird of paradise? Molecular and morphological evidence places *Macgregoria* in the Meliphagidae and the Cnemophilinae near the base of the corvoid tree. Proc. R. Soc. London, series B Biol. Sci. **267**: 233-241.

DUMBACHER, J. P. & FLEISCHER, R. C. (2001): Phylogenetic evidence for colour pattern convergence in toxic pitohuis: Müllerian mimicry in birds? Proc. R. Soc. London, series B Biol. Sci. **268**: 1971-1976.

ELLEGREN, H. (1992): Polymerase-chain-reaction (PCR) analysis of microsatellites--a new approach to studies of genetic relationships in birds. Auk **109**: 886-895.

ELLEGREN, H. (1994): Genomic DNA from museum feathers. pp. 211-217 in: Ancient DNA (eds. Herrmann, B. & Hemmel, S.). Springer-Verlag, New York.

ENGSTROM, M. D., MURPHY, R. W. & HADDRATH, O. (1999): Sampling vertebrate collections for molecular research: practice and policies. pp. 315-330 in: Managing the Modern Herbarium: An Interdisciplinary Approach (eds. MEGSTER, D.A. & BYERS, S.C.). Society for the Preservation of Natural History Collections, Washington, D.C.

FEHRER, J. (1993): Interspecies-Kreuzungen bei cardueliden Finken und Prachtfinken. In: Typen des Lebens (S. SCHERER, ed.), pp. 197-216. Studium Integrale, Pascal Verlag, Berlin.

GLENN, T. C., STEPHAN, W. & BRAUN, M. J. (1999): Effects of a population bottleneck on whooping crane mitochondrial DNA variation. Conservation Biology **13**: 1097-1107.

GRAVES, G. R. & BRAUN, M. J. (1992): Museums: storehouses of DNA? Science **255**: 1335-1336.

GÜTTINGER, H. R. (1973): Kopiervermögen von Rhythmus und Strophenaufbau in der Gesangsentwicklung einiger *Lonchura*-Arten (Estrildidae). Z. Tierpsychol. **32**: 374-385.

HILLIS, D. M., MORITZ, C. & MABLE, B. (eds.) (1996): Molecular Systematics, 2nd edn. Sinauer, Sunderland, Massachusetts.

HOUDE, P. & BRAUN, M. J. (1988): Museum collections as a source of DNA for studies of avian phylogeny. Auk **105**: 773-776.

IMMELMANN, K., STEINBACHER, J. & WOLTERS, H. E. (1965): Prachtfinken. 2nd, revised edition. vol. **1**. Verlag Hans Limberg, Aachen.

IMMELMANN, K., STEINBACHER, J. & WOLTERS, H. E. (1977): Prachtfinken. 2nd, revised edition. vol. **2**. Verlag Hans Limberg, Aachen.

IRWIN, M. P. S. (1958): A description of the unrecorded gape and mouth markings of the locust finch, *Ortygospiza locustella* with some breeding and other notes. Bull. Brit. Ornithol. Club **78**: 127-129.

JOHNSON, K. P., GOODMAN, S. M. & LANYON, S. M. (2000): A phylogenetic study of the Malagasy couas with insights into cuckoo relationships. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution **14**: 436-444.

KLEIN, N. K. & PAYNE, R. B. (1998): Evolutionary associations of brood parasitic finches (Vidua) and their host species: analyses of mitochondrial restriction sites. Evolution **52**: 299-315.

LEETON, P., CHRISTIDIS, L. & WESTERMAN, M. (1993): Feathers from museum bird skins--a good source of DNA for phylogenetic studies. Condor **95**: 465-467.

LOPEZ, J. V., YUHKI, N., MASUDA, R., MODI, W. & O'BRIEN, S. J. (1994): Numt, a recent transfer and tandem amplification of mitochondrial DNA to the nuclear genome of the domestic cat. Journal of Molecular Evolution **39**: 174-190.

LYNES, H. & SCLATER, W. L. (1934): Lynes-Vincent tour in Central and West Africa in 1930-31. Part II. Ibis **13** series, vol. **4**: 694-729.

MUNDY, N. L., UNITT, P. & WOODRUFF, D. S. (1997): Skin from feet of museum specimens as a non-destructive source of DNA for avian genotyping. Auk **114**: 126-129.

PÄÄBO, S. (1990): Amplifying ancient DNA. pp. 159-166 in: PCR Protocols: a guide to methods and applications (eds. INNIS, M. A., GELFLAND, D. H., SNINSKY, J. J. & WHITE, T. J.). Academic Press, San Diego.

PAYNE, R. B. (1980): Behavior and songs in hybrid parasitic finches. Auk **97**: 118-134.

PAYNE, R. B. (1997): Family Cuculidae (Cuckoos). pp. 508-607 in: Handbook of the Birds of the World, vol. 4 (eds. DEL HOYO, J., ELLIOTT, A. & SARGATAL, J.). BirdLife / Lynx Edicions, Barcelona.

PAYNE, R. B. (1998): Brood parasitism in birds: strangers in the nest. BioScience **48**: 377-386.

PAYNE, R. B., HUSTLER, H., STJERNSTEDT, R. SEFC, K. M. & SORENSON, M. D. (2002): Behavioural and genetic evidence of a recent population switch to a novel host species in brood parasitic indigobirds *Vidua chalybeata*. Ibis **145**: in press.

PAYNE, R. B., SEFC, K. M. & SORENSON, M. D. (in prep.): Molecular genetic analysis of a hybrid Vidua: origin of hybrids, mate choice, and a colonization model of association of brood parasites and their hosts.

Prinzinger, R., Kleim, J.-P., Schroth, W. & Schierwater, B. (1997): DNA sequence analysis of mitochondrial cyt-b and the species status of *Laniarius dubiosus* (Rchw. 1899). J. Ornithol. **138**: 291-296.

Remsen, J. V. (1995): The importance of continued collecting of bird specimens to ornithology and bird conservation. Bird Conservation Internat. **5**: 177-212.

Restall, R. L. (1996): A proposed new species of munia, genus *Lonchura* (Estrildinae). Bull. Brit. Ornithol. Club **116**: 137-142.

Restall, R. (1997): Munias and Mannikins. Yale University Press, New Haven.

Ruedas, L. A., Salazar-Bravo, J., Dragoo, J. W. & Yates, T .L. (2000): The importance of being earnest: what, if anything, constitutes a „specimen examined"? Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution **17**: 129-132.

Sefc, K. M., Payne, R. B. & Sorenson, M. D. (2001): Characterization of microsatellite loci in village indigobirds *Vidua chalybeata* and cross-species amplification in estrildid and ploceid finches. Molecular Ecology Notes 1: 252-254.

Sefc, K. M., Payne, R. B. & Sorenson, M. D. (2002): African forest radiations and relationships of sunbird-like warblers: moho *Hypergerus atriceps*, green hylia *Hylia prasina* and tit-hylia *Pholidornis rushiae*. Ostrich, in press.

Seutin, G., White, B. N. & Boag, P. T. (1991): Preservation of avian blood and tissue samples for DNA analyses. Canadian J. Zool. **69**: 82-90.

Sibley, C. G. & Monroe, B. L. (1990): Distribution and Taxonomy of Birds of the World. Yale University Press, New Haven.

Smith, E. F. G., Arctander, P., Fjeldså, J. & Osman Gedow Amir (1991): A new species of shrike (Laniidae: *Laniarius*) from Somalia, verified by DNA sequence data from the only known individual. Ibis **133**: 227-236.

Sorenson, M. D. & Fleischer, R. C. (1996:. Multiple independent transpositions of mitochondrial DNA control region sequences to the nucleus. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **93**: 15239-15243.

Sorenson, M. D. & Payne, R. B. (1999): Cuckoos: molecular genetic estimates of phylogeny and the origins of brood parasitism. Abstract, American Ornithologists' Union, Cornell University, 1999.

Sorenson, M. D. & Payne, R. B. (2001a): A single origin of brood parasitism in African finches: implications for host-parasite coevolution. Evolution **55**: 2550-2567.

Sorenson, M. D. & Payne, R. B. (2001b): Phylogeny and biogeography of estrildid finches: tests of species limits and implications for the coevolution of estrildids and their brood parasites. Ostrich Suppl. 15, Proc. 10th Pan-African Ornithol. Congress, Kampala, Uganda: 23.

Sorenson, M. D. & Payne, R. B. (2002): Molecular genetic perspectives on avian brood parasitism. Integrative and Comparative Biology **42**: in press.

Sorenson, M. D. & Quinn, T. W. (1998): Numts: a challenge for avian systematics and population biology. Auk **115**: 214-221.

Sorenson, M. D., Ast, J. C., Dimcheff, D. E., Yuri, T. & Mindell, D. P. (1999): Primers for a PCR-based approach to mitochondrial genome sequencing in birds and other vertebrates. Mol. Phylogen. Evol. **12**: 105-114.

Taberlet, P. & Bouvet, J. (1991): A single plucked feather as a source of DNA for bird genetic studies. Auk **108**: 959-960.

Thomas, W. K., Pääbo, S., Villablanca, F. X. & Wilson, A. C. (1990): Spatial and temporal continuity of kangaroo rat populations shown by sequencing mitochondrial DNA from museum specimens. J. Mol. Evol. **31**: 101-112.

van Balen, S. (1998): A hybrid munia? Bull. Brit. Ornithol. Club **118**: 118-119.

Winker, K., Braun, M. J. & Graves, G. R. (1996): Voucher specimens and quality control in avian molecular studies. Ibis **138**: 345-346.

Winker, K. (2000): Obtaining, preserving, and preparing bird specimens. J. Field Ornithology **71**: 250-297.

Robert B. Payne, Museum of Zoology and Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1079, USA

Michael D. Sorenson, Department of Biology, Boston University, 5 Cummington Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, USA

Bonner zoologische Beiträge	Band **51** (2002)	Heft 2/3	Seiten 105-108	Bonn, September 2003

Molecular Phylogenetics – What can Museums Contribute?

Andreas J. Helbig
University of Greifswald, Vogelwarte Hiddensee

Abstract. With the rapid increase of molecular applications in systematics and evolutionary biology, the role of museum collections is changing and broadening. In addition to specimen collections, museums should strive to build up tissue (including blood) collections specifically aimed at providing material for DNA typing or sequencing. Technical requirements for preservation and storage of tissues are trivial compared to traditional specimens. Obtaining suitable material is also much easier than obtaining material for specimens or skeletal preparations, so large numbers of samples can be stored (without freezing). Some recommendations are given on how to collect, preserve, label and store such material. Blood or soft tissue are best stored in 95-98 % ethanol, EDTA (10 %)-thymol buffer or DMSO-NaCl, none of which requires freezing for long-term storage. Fixation in formalin or blood sampling with heparin are to be avoided. Free availability of such samples to the scientific community and efficient exchange of information (e.g. via internet homepages of museums) on which species are available where are important prerequisites to make fuller use of existing collections.

Key words. Techniques for tissue collection, DNA analysis, avian collections

1. INTRODUCTION

With the technical innovations in molecular biology in the 1980s and 1990s, the use of DNA sequences and other types of molecular markers has become routine in fields such as systematics, phylogenetics, population genetics and behavioural ecology. In fact, most major advances in these fields over the past 20 years were entirely dependent on novel molecular methods such as polymerase chain reaction (PCR), DNA sequencing, single- or multi-locus genotyping and, coming into the fore just now, microarrays for the study of gene expression (e.g. Enard et al. 2002). Enormous progress has been made in understanding the phylogeny of all kinds of organisms and many questions once thought to be unsolvable are now being tackled or can already be answered with a high degree of confidence. Prominent examples include the phylogeny of vascular plants (Pryer et al. 2001), in particular angiosperms (Kuzloff & Gasser 2000), and of mammalian orders (Murphy et al. 2001).

With these recent developments, the role of collections in natural history museums and the kinds of material they preserve has to be viewed in a new light. In many quarters of the biological sciences, especially in Germany, there is a general feeling that specimen collections are no longer needed for active research or, to put it another way, that no major advances in biology based on specimen collections are to be expected. This highly biased and pessimistic view must certainly change, but with it museum collections must also change to meet the demands of modern systematics and evolutionary research. Since it is no longer just the skin or the skeleton of a bird or mammal that researchers need to make full use of a specimen, museums should make every effort to also preserve samples of soft tissue suitable for extraction of high molecular weight DNA.

Below I will give some recommendations for sample preservation from my own experience with DNA sequencing from avian material. Some opinions regarding the role of museum collections and ways of exchanging material follow.

2. PRESERVATION OF SAMPLES SUITABLE FOR DNA TYPING AND SEQUENCING

Under favourable conditions it is possible to extract amplifiable DNA from museum specimens up to the age of several decades (Cooper 1993, Ellegren 1993). However, such DNA is always degraded to various extents (depending on storage conditions) and obtaining the desired information from DNA of specimens not preserved for this purpose is technically much more demanding and more error-prone than from DNA of freshly preserved tissue. Collections of stuffed specimens, therefore, can be no substitute for a tissue collection specifically aimed at providing material for molecular studies.

Technical requirements for adequate preservation of tissue samples for DNA studies are rather trivial: 0.5 – 1 gram of fresh – preferably muscle – tissue should be cut up into small pieces and stored in 95-98% ethanol. No particularly high grade of ethanol is needed, most commercially available kinds will do. Samples should be stored in screw-top vials (glass or durable plastic) with a rubber-sealed screw-top. To minimize demand for space, 2 ml vials are ideal. If tissue is stored in small pieces in a ratio of 1 vol. tis-

sue to 1 vol. 98 % ethanol, sufficient material for dozens of DNA extractions (aliquots to different laboratories) can be stored in a 2 ml vial.

For optimal preservation of DNA, short post-mortem times are crucial, i.e. samples should be placed in ethanol as soon after death of the animal as possible (normally in the field just after collecting). Contamination can best be avoided by cutting tissue from inside the animal excluding parts that were exposed to the outside such as skin or feathers.

Long-term storage of ethanol-preserved samples is feasible without freezing. If cooling space is limited, storage at 4 °C is fully acceptable. Whether freezing at -18 ° to -22 °C provides any advantage justifying the additional cost is debatable, but it will not do any harm and minimizes potential problems of ethanol evaporation (which may occur even from rubber-sealed vials). Failure of freezers (e.g. due to a power failure) should not affect ethanol-preserved tissue samples. Apart from ethanol, various buffers, e.g. EDTA (10 %) – NaF (1 %) – Thymol (trace) solution (Arctander 1988), DMSO (Dimethylsulfoxid) saturated with NaCl (Arctander & Fjeldsa 1994) or even laundry detergent (Bahl & Pfenninger 1996) are probably equally suited for blood and soft tissue preservation. Deep-freezing is not necessary for any of these, but long-term storage at 4 °C is recommended. Unfortunately, high molecular-weight DNA can usually not be extracted from specimens or tissues fixed in formalin (or other histological fixatives) prior to storage in alcohol (Cann et al. 1993; personal experience). Fixation should, therefore, be avoided with material intended for later DNA analysis.

A seemingly trivial but often neglected issue is the labelling of samples. Lables should not be immersed with the tissue sample. Also, writing onto the vial with any kind of („permanent") feltpen or other type of marker is not the ideal way of labelling, because such writing does tend to come off in the long term, especially if it comes into contact with alcohol or other solvents. In our tissue collection we use laser-printed labels taped with clear tape all around the (clean and dry) vial.

3. TYPES OF TISSUE TO BE PRESERVED

All types of tissues including blood or feathers can be preserved in the way described above. Preservation in ethanol is preferable over air-drying (of blood drops) or just keeping feathers sealed in a plastic bag. DNA can be isolated from most tissues and body components of an animal including skin, hair (Higuchi et al. 1988), feathers (Taberlet & Bouvet 1991; Ellegren 1993; Leeton et al. 1993), bones, teeth, egg shell membranes (Strausberger & Ashley 2001), blood, semen, saliva and even cells in faeces (Segelbacher & Steinbrück 2001). However, there are huge differences in the amount and quality of DNA that can be recovered and in the amount and technical sophistication of work required to extract DNA from the various sources. For these reasons, if there is a choice, one should preserve those tissues that are ideal for DNA isolation (muscle, blood), not necessarily those that are easiest to obtain or to store.

A major consideration, of course, is whether the animal needs to be killed. Apart from the fact that it is always preferable to have a complete voucher specimen along with a tissue sample, sampling for DNA analysis is possible in most cases without harming the animal and without compromising the efficiency of DNA extraction. In birds, there are two main options: blood or feathers. Blood has the advantage of yielding much greater quantities of DNA, which is important if several or many molecular analyses (e.g. sequencing of a number of different genes, each of which may require several PCR reactions) are to be conducted and if samples are to be collected for distribution to multiple laboratories. Some researchers advocate collection of feathers rather than blood on the grounds that (co-) amplification of nuclear copies of mitochondrial DNA („numts") is less likely from feather DNA than from blood-derived DNA (Payne & Sorensen, this issue). Although this is true, the argument is a weak one since avoidance of 'numts' should never rely primarily on the source of DNA. Mitochondrial sequence-specific primers and verification of sequence by amplification with several different primer combinations (preferably „long-fragment PCR") are mandatory anyway to exclude amplification of non-target sequences. Given such precautions, mitochondrial sequences can be obtained from fresh, total DNA extracted from blood just as easily as from DNA of feathers (or internal body tissues).

Feathers, although easier to collect, have the drawback of containing very few (usually dead and dried) cells and correspondingly little DNA. In theory, this should not be a problem since a PCR reaction needs only a few target molecules to work. However, the smaller the amount of target DNA available, the fewer PCR reactions can be run, thus compromising the option to verify a sequence with alternative amplification primers. Also, the danger of (co-)amplifying contaminant sequences is inversely related to the amount of target DNA available to the PCR reaction. The fewer target molecules a PCR has to start from, the greater can be the relative proportion of non-target molecules that may be coamplified. This is a problem especially if PCR products are to be cloned, less so, if direct sequencing is intended. Thus, sampling for purposes of DNA typing or sequencing should be done in